

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 24, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 2, 10, 14, 15 and 20 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Specifically, the Office Action provides:

Claims 10, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims recite a method has [sic] an open-ended result. It produces a result only open satisfying a condition [sic]. It does not mention other condition [sic]. It means it does not produce anything when the condition is not satisfied.

See *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 10 depends from claim 7 and claim 6. Claim 14 depends from claim 6. Thus, both claims recite “a method for indicating annotated objects in a relational view of data having rows of individual cells” that includes the limitation recited by claim 6 of “providing an indication of those objects in the view having the identified corresponding annotations, based on the one or more indicia maps. Claim 10 further characterizes what gets provided, “based on the one or more indicia maps.” As recited by claim 10, an annotation icon is displayed for each row and cell for which a bit is set in the indicia map corresponding to that row or cell. Claim 14 characterizes how the indicia maps may be generated. As recited by claim 14, the indicia maps may be generated using a temporary table and then combining rows of the table, as claimed. In both cases, the “indicia map” is provided. Thus, Applicants submit that both claims 10 and 14 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 § U.S.C. 101. Nevertheless, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 10 and 14 to eliminate the

use of the conjunction “if.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 5, and, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner suggests that the limitation of “‘a specified group’ is vague because it is not defined.” Applicants have amended claim 2 to address this rejection.

Regarding Claim 4, the Examiner suggests that “the ‘first bit’ and ‘second bit’ are vague because they are not defined.” Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, to clarify that the indicia map includes a plurality of bits.

Regarding Claim 14, the Examiner suggests that “‘in a common row’ is not taught in specification.” Respectfully, Applicants point the Examiner to paragraphs [0042] and [0043] of the specification. These two paragraphs describe generating a temporary table to indicate the presence of annotations for rows and cells and also describe combining the rows of the temporary table to generate the indicia map for the combined row. For consistency, however, Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite “a combined row.”

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 2, 5, and 14 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1-3, 5-9, 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Matter* (US 2004/0163050). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Matter* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim." For example, *Matter* does not disclose a "method for indicating objects in a view of data having corresponding annotations" that includes "querying an annotation store to identify annotations corresponding to objects in the view," as recited by claim 1. Claims 6, 15, and 20 recite similar limitations. The Examiner argues that *Matter* discloses querying an annotation store to identify annotations corresponding to objects in the view at *Matter*, paragraphs 0057, 0060, 0061, 0063, 0064, 0104, and 0105. *Matter* is generally directed to "Systems and methods for managing negotiated transactions," that is, to a method for negotiating a variety of contracts. Paragraphs 0104 and 0105, in fact, describe an interface which allows a user to add a "Legal Reference" to a "Master Matrix Worksheet." More specifically, these paragraphs describe an interface used to add a reference to various provisions and business rules using key words, and dates. For example, paragraph 0104 provides in part:

Using the Select Legal Database drop-down field allows the user to choose an available online legal research service like Westlaw or Lexis. Once an online service is selected, the user may formulate a search query in the "Formulate Search Query" field. When satisfied with the form of query, the user may select Run Query and the system will perform an automated login sequence that would connect to the selected service. Once connected, the query would be uploaded to the online service and executed. The online service screen would display in the search results field.

Matter, ¶ 0104. Paragraph 0105 then describes how the query of the legal database may be stored in a spread sheet and accessed using a link. Additionally, paragraphs 0057, 0060, 0061, 0063, and 0064 describe a variety of information related to a contract

(e.g., alternative clauses, required clauses, suggested clauses, relevant legal opinions, etc.) that may be stored in a spreadsheet. As disclosed in *Matter*, individual clauses of a document may be indexed and stored in a first spreadsheet. Further, *Matter* discloses that different portions of the document may be stored in a second spreadsheet and cross-referenced to portions of the first spreadsheet. Thus, *Matter* does not teach that annotations are indexed to correspond to objects *in a view of data*, but only teaches that they are cross-referenced to correspond with some objects. Further, *Matter* does not disclose indicia maps, where “each indicia map includes a plurality of bits and wherein each bit may be set to indicate an existence of an annotation for a corresponding one of the objects in the view of data, as recited by claim 1. Claims 6, 15, and 20 recite similar limitations. Instead, *Matter* is clearly directed to a collection of spreadsheets used to store information relevant to negotiated transactions, (e.g., contract negotiations).

Matter also fails to teach generating one or more indicia maps indicating which, if any, objects in the view have corresponding annotations. This is hardly surprising, as *Matter* does not disclose indicia maps in general. In paragraph 0064, cited by the Examiner, *Matter* teaches *storing* information a collection of related spreadsheets, where within one spreadsheet, there is a spreadsheet containing provisions of an original document and a second spreadsheet corresponding to the first spreadsheet which contains the related annotations. In contrast, claim 1 recites generating an indicia map from an annotation store. That is evaluating an annotation store, and a view of objects to determine which, if any objects in the view annotations in the annotation store. Further, the indicia map is characterized as including “a plurality of bits and wherein each bit may be set to indicate an existence of an annotation for a corresponding one of the objects in the view of data.” Nothing in the passages from *Matter* cited by the Examiner disclose an indicia map, so characterized or otherwise, Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, claim 1 and its dependents are believed to be allowable and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 15 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. For all the reasons given above, therefore, Applicants submit that *Matter* fails to claims 6, 15, and 20. Specifically, *Matter* does not teach querying an annotation store to identify

annotations corresponding to objects in view. Accordingly, claims 6, 15, and 23 and their respective dependents are believed to be allowable and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 10, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matter* (US 2004/0163050) in view of *Wang et al.* (7,065,705).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matter* (US 2004/0163050) in view of *Hughes* (6,275,223).

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Claims 10, 12, and 13 depend from claim 6. For reasons stated above, claims 1 and 6 and their dependents are believed to be allowable and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)